

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VIII.

JUNE, 1928.

No. 6.

---

## Of Faith.

(Continued.)

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part III.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

But where is it written that Abraham believed Christ? Does not Scripture rather designate the promise of the Seed as the contents of his faith? True, but this Seed was Christ. This is the testimony of the same apostle who sets Abraham's faith before us as an example. Gal. 3, 6. But if Abraham became righteous through faith in the Seed, and if this Seed was Christ, then he became righteous through faith in Christ. Pray do not tell us that we illumine the mind of Abraham with the torch of Paul; that the patriarch understood the seed to be a child and nothing more. Nothing more? May it tickle the contemporaries to crowd their father Abraham under their footstool — he was greater than they. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day," says Christ, "and he saw it and was glad." John 8, 56. It makes no difference whether one takes the "day of Christ" to be the day of His incarnation or the day of His appearing in the Plain of Mamre — it is certain that Abraham saw Christ, either with the eyes of his body in the door of his tent or by faith, when God promised him Seed, or both. See Him he did; this Christ testifies expressly, and so also the Jews understand Him: "Thou art not yet fifty years old and hast seen Abraham?" John 8, 57. How in the name of common sense can there have been a personal acquaintance between you? Very easily, answers Christ; for "I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." John 8, 58. Will you still say that we illumine the eyes of Abraham with the lamp of Paul? Methinks they do not need it. One should not picture the patriarchs to one's eyes as poor simpletons — with eyes turned to the ground, moved by earthly promises, without knowledge of Christ, and without hope of the life to come. Did they not have the Gospel of the "Seed of the woman" who was to bruise the head of the serpent? Gen. 3, 15. And they faithfully pondered it in their

hearts and waited for their Savior, from Eve, Gen. 4, 1, to Simeon, Luke 2, 25—37. [Note.—Gen. 4, 1 can mean nothing else than, “I have the Man Jehovah.”] “And [they] confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth,” Heb. 11, 13, “and looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder is God,” Heb. 11, 10. “Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God.” Heb. 11, 16. And would you know the difference between Abraham’s faith and ours? We become righteous through faith in the Lord who has come; Abraham, through faith in the Lord who was to come. The object of our faith, therefore, is present as regards the virtue, but past as regards the time; what Abraham believed was also present as regards the virtue, but future as regards the time.

So the example of Abraham also confirms the thesis of the Formula of Concord: “For faith justifies, not for this cause or reason, that it is so good a work and so fair a virtue, but because it lays hold of, and accepts, the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel.” (*Triglotta*, p. 919.)

Now we shall also be able to answer the question which precedes, justification or faith. Faith certainly does not precede justification; else justification would take place for its sake instead of for Christ’s sake. Neither, however, does justification precede faith; otherwise it would take place without faith. Rather, both are together, or coincident. As the electric spark goes through your body at the same moment that your hand touches the wire, so God regards you righteous at the same moment that you apprehend Christ. “He that believeth hath,” we read John 3, 36; not: “He that believeth will receive.” Neither: “He that believeth hath had.” But: “He hath.” And Acts 13, 39: “All that believe are justified.” Not: “Will be justified,” or: “Have been justified,” but: “Are justified,” in the same moment in which they believe. Just as the woman who had an issue of blood was healed the very moment she touched Christ’s garment. Mark 5, 28, 29. For this reason the Holy Spirit so often says that we become righteous *through [by] faith*, Acts 26, 18; Rom. 3, 25, 28, 30; Gal. 2, 16; 3, 14; Eph. 2, 8; 3, 12, not for the sake of faith or in consequence of faith. Most strikingly, however, the matter is illustrated by a type to which the Lord Himself points us. When the fiery serpents in the desert tormented the children of Israel, Moses, by the command of God, made a serpent of brass and set it upon a pole; and if a serpent had bitten any man, he looked upon the serpent of brass, and *when he beheld, he lived.*

Num. 21, 6—9. So we become righteous the moment the eye of our faith looks up to its brazen serpent, the Son of Man, who was lifted up. John 3, 14—16.

But in order to safeguard the pure doctrine against corruption, Scripture adds “without works” to the words “by faith.” Eph. 2, 8. 9: “For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; *not of works*, lest any man should boast.” And still stronger Rom. 11, 6: “If by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace.” And Rom. 4, 2. 6: “If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. . . . Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth *righteousness without works*.” But if we are justified without works, then *all* works are rejected, be they small or great. For in the sight of God nothing counts but solely and only His beloved Son Jesus Christ; He is altogether pure and holy before Him. Where He is, there God looks and is well pleased in Him. Luke 3, 22. Now, the Son is not apprehended by works, but only by faith, without all works. (Luther, St. L. Ed., XVIII, 670.) So, then, works have absolutely nothing to do with justification, neither as merit nor as means. And when the Jesuits pretend that faith justifies through works, then this fiction is dashed to pieces in Eph. 2 and Rom. 4, just as that other one: faith and works. It certainly is not the same whether a prince rules through the Jesuits or without them.

Besides these comprehensive and unmistakable expressions others are found in Scripture, such as Rom. 3, 28: “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law,” and Gal. 2, 16: “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law.” But the Law includes all that which God has commanded, especially the Ten Commandments, Rom. 3, 20; and its sense is not carnal, but spiritual, Rom. 7, 14. “Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind . . . and thy neighbor as thyself.” Matt. 22, 37. 39. The works of this Law cannot possibly be anything else than works which conform to it: justice and love, and all the others. For Christ expressly numbers mercy and faith among the chief parts of the Law. “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” He cries out Matt. 23, 23, “for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cumin and have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and faith. These ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone.” But such works, in fact, all works, Paul excludes from justification. But when it is said

that the good works of the regenerate are not works of the Law, then this contradicts Jer. 31, 33. There God testifies that the saints of the New Covenant shall not lose the Law, but that it will be written in their hearts. So their works are truly works of the Law, a thousand times more works of the Law than those of the Pharisees. However, whether the Law be within or without, with justification it has not the least to do. This fact Scripture teaches expressly Rom. 3, 21: "The righteousness of God *without the Law* is manifested," and Gal. 3, 11: "No man is justified by the Law." Therefore cherish it in your heart as did Paul, Rom. 7, 22, humble yourself before it like Ahab, 1 Kings 21, 21. 27. 29,— it is not your righteousness before God.

But that God indeed disregards all works of the regenerate, even the best, when He acts judicially with us, is shown by the example of Abraham. For the apostle does not ask whereby he became righteous in his first conversion, when he emigrated from Chaldea, but he asks wherein the righteousness of Abraham consisted at the time when he was already adorned with a wreath of good works. By faith he had gone out of his father's house, Gen. 11, 31; Heb. 11, 8; by faith he had sojourned in the land of promise, Heb. 11, 9; had built altars unto God, Gen. 12, 7; 13, 18; had publicly called upon His name, Gen. 12, 7; 13, 4; had kept peace with Lot, Gen. 13, 8. 9; had not sought his own, Gen. 14, 21—24. In the midst of this course of truly good works the apostle stops him with the inquiry, "What is your righteousness?" Not his new obedience; not his humbleness; no blossom from the wreath of his works,— but this alone, that he laid hold on Christ; for He had been prophesied to him.

Therefore St. Clement of Rome teaches: "We do not become righteous through ourselves, or through our wisdom, or through our fear of God, or through works which we performed in pureness of heart, but through faith, by which God has justified all from the beginning." This our fathers summed up in these three words, "By faith *alone*." Luther translates Rom. 3, 28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified without the deeds of the Law, by faith alone." And to those who protested against this version because the word "alone" is not found in the original text, he replies: "I am surprised at the opposition in this manifest matter. Do tell me whether the death and resurrection of Christ is our work. It certainly is not our work nor the work of any Law. Now, alone the death and resurrection of Christ make us free from sin, as St. Paul says. Furthermore, tell me, which is

the work by which we take and hold the death and resurrection of Christ? It certainly must be no external work, but solely and only faith in the heart. This faith alone, yea, all alone, without all works, apprehends the death and resurrection of Christ where it is preached through the Gospel. . . . Now, if this is manifest, why, then, should we not also speak thus?" (Luther, St. L. Ed., XIX, 980f.) Article XX of the Augsburg Confession indeed uses this language four times. And the Apology advises those who are not pleased with the little word *sola* to erase in so many places in the epistles of St. Paul these words, "by grace," "not of works," "gift of God," "lest any man should boast." (*Trigl.*, 140.) Also the Formula of Concord confesses "that for the preservation of the pure doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God it is necessary to urge with special diligence the *particulae exclusivae*, that is, the exclusive particles, *i. e.*, the following words of the holy Apostle Paul, by which the merit of Christ is entirely separated from our works and the honor given to Christ alone, when the holy Apostle Paul writes: *Of grace, without merit, without Law, without works, not of works.* All these words together mean as much as that we are justified and saved alone by faith in Christ." (*Trigl.*, 795.) The *Book of Confessions* of Duke Julius of Brunswick (*Corpus Doctrinæ Julium*) declares with no less firmness that nothing must be put into the article of justification before God but what necessarily belongs into it, such as the pure grace and mercy of God, solely and exclusively the merit of Christ, our Lord, the alone-saving faith, which apprehends the grace of God and the merit of Christ, all of which the Scriptures combine and mean when they say, "by faith alone," "by grace," "for the sake of Christ, our Lord." But works are thus excluded in order that they be not mingled with the article of justification, neither as cause or merit of righteousness nor as means to acquire righteousness, or as the form or constituent part of justification, or under whatever other show or title it might be done. For also that would be false if one were to deduce or conclude this, that faith, in order to make righteous and save, must necessarily have with it good works, or that the presence of good works were necessary before God in order that faith might make us righteous before God, as though it could not accomplish this without works. For St. Paul testifies that this is false by ascribing and attributing justification before God solely to the grace of God, solely to the merit of Christ, solely to faith, and posits it alone in the reconciliation to God and in His receiving us into grace without any preceding, concomitant,

or following works. So also Chemnitz teaches in his private writings, also Aegidius Hunnius, likewise Gerhard, together with their followers. Even V. E. Loescher still defends the old pure doctrine with zeal and earnestness. But the confession of the fathers lived, and still lives, especially in the church-hymns.

But we exclude good works "not in the sense that a true faith can exist without contrition or that good works should, must, and dare not follow true faith as sure and indubitable fruits, or that believers dare not nor must do anything good; but good works are excluded from the article of justification before God so that they must not be drawn into, woven into, or mingled with, the transaction of the justification of the poor sinner before God as necessary and belonging to it." (*Trigl.*, 927.)

But what is the disposition and nature of our faith? Is it a feeling of dependence, as some say? Maybe the "faith" of the heathen is of this nature, for they neither know of God nor trust in Him; but not our faith; for our faith is knowledge and confidence. That it is knowledge is shown by those texts in which "believing" and "knowing" are joined together, forming one expression. Thus it is said John 6, 69: "We believe and are sure [Luther: "*haben erkannt*"] that Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," and Eph. 4, 13: "Till we all come in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God"; also John 17, 8: "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me; and they have received them and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me." But lest any one form the opinion as though faith and knowledge were altogether different things, Scripture, in the quoted texts, often simply says "knowing" for "believing." Is. 53, 11: "By His knowledge shall My righteous Servant justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities." John 17, 3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." At the same time other texts teach that eternal life consists in *faith* in Jesus. John 3, 16. 36; 5, 24; 6, 40. Now, either John contradicts John and Christ contradicts Christ in these texts, or "knowing" is "believing." Similarly we read 2 Pet. 2, 20: "After they have escaped the pollutions of this world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," and 1 Tim. 2, 4: "God will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." According to this it is certain that knowledge is one part of the essence of the Christian faith. True, not knowledge alone, but also confidence. Right there where justification by

faith is described for the first time, Gen. 15, 6, the original text says Abraham “trusted” in God. Just so in many other texts: Is. 7, 9; Num. 14, 11; 2 Chron. 20, 20; Ps. 114, 10. Is. 28, 16 the same verb is applied to Christ: “Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a Stone, a tried Stone, a precious Corner-stone, a sure Foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste.” This is also the basic meaning of the verb “to believe” in the New Testament. With the heathen authors it means to trust in men or in their words; in the New Testament, to trust in Christ. Such confidence in Him is the fundamental condition of all healing of the body, Matt. 9, 22; Mark 5, 36, and of the soul. Therefore the Lord says to the man sick of the palsy, Matt. 9, 2: “Son, *be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee.*” And with his joyous “Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world” He urges His apostles to believe. But our faith is such a firm confidence that it banishes doubt and sinks itself with all its might down into Christ, the Rock. [Note.—*Πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν.* Matt. 18, 6; Mark 9, 42; John 2, 11; 3, 16. 18; Acts 10, 43; Gal. 2, 16; Phil. 1, 29; 1 Pet. 1, 8.] Finally, God combines both parts of faith Is. 43, 10: “Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord, and My Servant, whom I have chosen, that ye may *know* and *believe* Me and understand that I am He.”

Whether we, therefore, say with Chemnitz that faith has four parts: knowledge, assent, longing of the heart, and confidence, or with Gerhard that it has three parts: knowledge, assent, and confidence, these two, knowledge and confidence, will always remain the chief ones. For knowledge and will are the two basic powers of our soul, and when the Holy Spirit moves it, it reaches with both its arms for the precious pearl. (Note.—God is the Author of faith, Matt. 16, 16. 17; Heb. 12, 2; His instrument is the Word, John 17, 20; Rom. 10, 17.) Therefore we teach with the Apology: “That faith which makes pious and righteous before God is not merely this, that I know the stories of Christ’s birth, suffering, etc. (these things the devils, too, know), but it is the certainty or the certain trust in the heart, when with my whole heart I regard the promises of God as certain and true, through which there are offered me, without my merit, the forgiveness of sins, grace, and all salvation, through Christ the Mediator.” (Trigl., German text, 134.)

Good, says Perrone, and thence comes the happy disposition of the Protestants which enables them to comfort themselves with the forgiveness of their sins in fornication and murder if they only

hold firmly to their faith. (*"Inde rursum originem habet illa securitas, illa jucunditas, qua inter fornicationes, adulteria, homicidia, aliaque ejusmodi peccata laetantur Protestantes, dummodo firmi in fide persistant, juxta Lutherum."*) Perhaps it is more convenient to use the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free for a cloak of maliciousness than the miracle-working medallion of Pope Gregory XVI. We shall leave the decision to Perrone. We, for our part, know nothing of forgiveness under unchastity and murder. The blood of Christ and sin agree like fire and water: either the water escapes in vapor, or the fire is extinguished. 2 Cor. 6, 15; 2 Tim. 2, 19. If a man says that he is saved in Christ and is a murderer, he lies, for "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3, 15. "Neither fornicators nor idolaters, nor adulterers, . . . nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 6, 9. 10; Gal. 5, 19—21. Therefore God's Word links repentance and faith together with an adamant chain. Paul himself at all times testified to both the Jews and Greeks "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20, 20. 21. Yes, the very first sermon which flowed from the lips of Christ was: "Repent ye and believe the Gospel." Mark 1, 15. These two go hand in hand throughout the whole Scriptures to the Revelation of John. Rev. 3, 3. Repentance is always the beginning, Acts 26, 20, so much so that God's Word sometimes includes faith in it and says "repentance" for both. Matt. 3, 2; 4, 17; Mark 6, 12; Luke 15, 7; Acts 11, 18; 17, 30. In fact, none other come to Christ but they that labor, Matt. 11, 28; neither does God give beauty for beauty, but beauty for ashes; not oil of joy for oil of joy, but oil of joy for mourning; and the beautiful garment of the righteousness of Christ no one receives but only they that mourn in Zion. Is. 61, 3. Therefore the psalms abound in penitential complaints: "Mine iniquities are gone over mine head; as a heavy burden they are too heavy for me." Ps. 38, 4. "Out of the depths have I cried unto Thee, O Lord. Lord, hear my voice; let Thine ear be attentive to the voice of my supplications. If Thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" Ps. 130, 1—3. (Note.—In general, the seven Penitential Psalms: Pss. 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143.) Thus our fathers complained with King David and then rejoiced with him: "Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless His holy name, . . . who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases." Ps. 103, 1. 3. Therefore they also confessed at all times that the doctrine of justification

exists for none other than terrified consciences and that it cannot be understood apart from the penitential conflict. (*Trigl.*, 55.) And the Smalcald Articles declare: "This, then, is the thunderbolt of God by which He strikes in a heap both manifest sinners and false saints . . . and drives them all together to terror and despair. . . . This is true sorrow of heart, suffering and sensation of death. This, then, is what it means to begin true repentance; and here man must hear such a sentence: You are all of no account, whether you be manifest sinners or saints; you all must become different and do otherwise than you are now doing. [Only then comes] the consolatory promise of grace through the Gospel." (*Trigl.*, 479f.) So also the Formula of Concord teaches (*Trigl.*, 923. 953—955), yes, even the much-maligned Confession of the faculty of Wittenberg of the year 1665. (*Consensus Repetitus Fidei Vere Lutheranae*.) And Martin Chemnitz says: "The pure doctrine of the Word of God concerning justification can be understood by such only as in affliction are troubled on account of their sins or are trembling in the agony of death." And so they all teach. Repentance is wrought, however, by the Word of God, that breaketh the rock in pieces, *Jer. 23, 29*; not by the Gospel, which "is properly nothing else than the preaching of consolation and a joyful message" (*Trigl.*, 803), but by the Law (*Trigl.*, 478. 480. 955—961). God assists in this with the hammer of the cross. For vexation teaches to give heed to the Word. Repentance, however, is not a means of atonement (*Trigl.*, 257), neither is our faith; but the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from sins.

---

### The Historical Significance of the Formula of Concord.

PROF. R. W. HEINTZE, St. Louis, Mo.

#### III.

When Schmauck, in his *Lutheran Confessions*, comes to speak about the Smalcald Alliance, he calls the Augsburg Confession its Articles of Confederation. Through the Peace of Augsburg, 1555, the Augustana became a mark of safety. The Religious Peace decreed that the Roman churches and those that subscribed to the Augsburg Confession should both be equally recognized as legitimate. That did not mean religious liberty, neither in principle nor in number of religions included. It still recognized the necessity of state's license and restricted this license to two bodies. In addition, the *reservatum ecclesiasticum* put the one at a decided

disadvantage over against the other and not only checked the expansion of the Lutheran Church, but in a straight line led to the first world war of modern history.

The peace agreement did not name the church-body that was to be legitimated; it described it as "the signers of the Augsburg Confession." John Calvin subscribed at Ratisbon. In a letter to a pastor he wrote (1557): "And truly I do not reject the Augustana, which I signed recently voluntarily and gladly, just as its author himself has explained it."<sup>1)</sup> Seventeen years had passed since its presentation to emperor and diet; what need was there to ask Melanchthon about its meaning?

In 1541 another attempt at union between the Lutherans and the Romanists had been made at Worms. At this colloquy Dr. Eck protested against the use of the Augustana copy at hand because it was not an exact copy of the document of 1530. Melanchthon had, already in the thirties, recast parts of the Apology "to improve the passage concerning justification,"<sup>2)</sup> but had not published this revision. He had also revised — and published — the Augsburg Confession, 1540 and 1542. The changes improved the logical order of some of the articles. They amplified several expressions, rendering them clearer and more definite; and more Scripture-proof had been adduced. But also the emphasis of doctrinal statements had been changed, *e. g.*, in Articles 5, 20, 18, and 10. The changes stressed that repentance and good works are necessary; they spoke of free will in such a manner that a synergistic understanding was made easy. There was no immediate offense given, not even by the changing of Article 10. The import of the change was not seen at once, *e. g.*, of the change from "They teach that the body and the blood of Christ are really present and are distributed to those who partake of the Lord's Supper, and they denounce such as teach otherwise" to "On the Lord's Supper they teach that with the bread and the wine truly the body and the blood are offered to those who partake of," etc. The omission of the denunciation of those who teach contrary to the Word of God not only left the union with the Swiss untouched, but was a safeguard for himself and all others whose position on the Lord's Supper was wobbly. *This Augsburg Confession could be subscribed by Calvin — and was.*

However, during the Interim conflict and the following years it became evident that there was a wide cleavage between Melanchthon and his Wittenberg faculty, on the one hand, and the Gnesio-

1) *Epistolae*, p. 437.

2) *Corp. Ref.*, XXVI, 339.

Lutherans, on the other, a cleavage in several respects so wide that the words which Luther spoke to Zwingli at Marburg might have been repeated. True, when the evangelical princes met at Naumburg, 1561, in order to send a declaration of their stand to Trent, they declared that their signing the reprint of the Augustana of 1530—31 was not to be interpreted as a disavowal of the *Variata*. But there was a deep sentiment of dissatisfaction in those who had denounced the Interims and had denounced Melanchthon.

Wittenberg University had lost the confidence of these men. Nicolaus von Amsdorf had written a little book charging Wittenberg with the suppression of important writings of Luther.<sup>3)</sup> Suspicion was aroused that also the alteration of the first "constitution" of the young Church hid in its pages all sorts of possibilities of unbiblical thought, although not yet clearly discerned. Such conditions bred a feeling of anxiety, fear-of-ambush tactics, and the like. But the condition became acute. Frederick, of the Duchy of Saxony, refused to sign the new document at Naumburg; he would subscribe only to that of 1531 and to the Smalcald Articles. Being in the minority, he withdrew, and after some time the other princes, having revoked their signatures, joined the secessionist. No, not all; the Elector of the Palatinate went one step farther. He openly joined the Calvinists and instructed his clergy to preach and to teach according to the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

At this time Melanchthon was no more: he had died in April, 1560. But his spirit continued to live in another German book, which came to be looked upon as the confession of the Church: the *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* (1560, Leipzig).<sup>4)</sup> It was followed by a Latin edition. The two were not identical, the German giving an earlier Augustana (1533), the Latin printing the *Variata* with the addition of the early text, article for article. The Smalcald Articles were removed, likewise Luther's Catechisms. In 1551 he had formulated a confession for Saxony; then he had set up a regulation for the examination of the candidates for ordination (a sort of catechism); then he had published an essay on the doctrinal situation in Bavaria and an answer to Servetus. Since 1521 he had produced a dogmatics (*Loci Communes*). This *Corpus Doctrinae* justly bore the name *Philippic*.

3) *das die zu Witt. im andern Teil der buecher Doctoris Martini im buch, das diese Wort Christi noch fest stehen, mehr denn ein blat 4 ganzer Paragraphos vorsetzlich ausgelassen haben.*

4) *Corp. Ref.*, XXI, 587; XXII, 35. His prefaces, IX, 929, and 1050.

*cum*; for with the exception of the three Ecumenical Symbols it contained only his own statements. The Elector of Saxony, in whose territory Wittenberg was, introduced the *Corpus* largely for instruction in schools, while other princes had the Catechisms and the Smalcald Articles added.

There are two observations to be made in this connection. One is that what had been done in the Saxon Electorate could be done elsewhere and was done, *viz.*, various parts of the church established their own territorial confessional *symbolum*. Pomerania produced its own *Corpus Doctrinae*, combining a revised *Philippicum* with a set of products from Luther's pen. Thuringia, 1570, when efforts at unity already were being made, compiled its *Corpus Doctrinae*, adding to the former confessions a work of Menius, dated 1549, and the Saxon *Refutation of Flacius*, dated 1559. Brandenburg accepted the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, Luther's Small Catechism, and — extracts from Luther's works, including his postils.

One of the purposes of a symbol is thus frustrated. When we visualize the actual working out of these arrangements, considering that this material was also to be used as a basis for instruction, we must get the picture of Brandenburg preachers stressing this, Saxon preachers stressing that; of Pomeranian children being instructed in conceptions of one kind and Thuringia children in those of another. The contemporary Church was being disrupted, and the coming generation was vaccinated with disruptive vaccine.

The second point is that writings of individual theologians had been embodied in symbols which were meant to be the confession of the Church. The fact that the writings of these theologians had emanated from minds — let us rather say hearts — which differed very widely from one another, that the one set came from the heart of a theologian — or let me say Christian — who felt in conscience bound to *confess* the very revelation of God, without consideration as to what the consequence might be, while the other set was the expression of a man who was determined, in order to "protect" the Church, to take the middle of the road, ought to make it evident to us that, because one section followed this, the other section another tendency and sentiment, the state of the Church, which, though she had gained her independence, was being kept from working harmoniously together, was extremely critical; for the Articles of Confederation were no longer able to keep the Church at real work under them. The Critical Period of the sixteenth century!

(To be continued.)

## The Horrors of Voltaire's Last Days.

PROF. JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

Several years ago, when the writer, in one of his Lenten addresses at the American Theater in St. Louis, ventured the statement that Voltaire died a horrible death, he was wrathfully assailed and branded a liar by an atheistic publication in the East. A friend, who sent him the clipping, begged that the matter be discussed in one of our periodicals and that the evidence for the opinion expressed be definitely presented. Other, more pressing work prevented the writer from complying with the request. Recently, however, when the Rev. Mr. Sunday, in one of his addresses at St. Louis, averred that the death of Voltaire was a most horrible one, he, too, was attacked by a writer in one of the daily papers published in St. Louis. Other periodicals took up the question, charging that the claim that Voltaire died in despair was a downright falsehood. The writer, therefore, feels that the evidence should no longer be withheld. Special thanks are due to Father Regnet, Librarian of St. Louis University, and to Mrs. Moody, Librarian-in-Chief of the Reference Department of the St. Louis Public Library; both assisted him faithfully in making the necessary sources accessible.

The controversy about the manner in which Voltaire died, will, no doubt, never be settled to the satisfaction of every person interested in this moot point. Not only avowed infidels, but also scholars without religious prejudices have emphatically declared that the death of Voltaire was altogether peaceful, and that it was accompanied by no other "horrors" than such as his excessive use of opium and stimulants, his "follies," which followed upon his last triumph at Paris, and his unpardonable overwork brought about.

This claim is well summarized in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, which says in part: "For about a fortnight he was alternately better and worse; but on May 30 the priests were once more sent for, to wit, his nephew, the Abbé Mignot, the Abbé Gaultier, and the curé of St. Sulpice. He was, however, in a state of half insensibility and petulantly motioned them away. *The legends set afloat about his dying in a state of terror and despair are certainly false.*"

François Marie Arouet de Voltaire was born on November 21, 1694, and died on May 30, 1778, at the age of eighty-four years.

We are now not interested in the unsavory life of this selfish, deceitful, and blasphemous writer; it is his death which claims our attention.

Those who declare that there is no shred of evidence upon which to hang the statement that this cowardly and unlovable person died in terror and despair are either ignorant of the his-

torical facts or are deliberately stating a falsehood. Father Kreiten, in his excellent work *Voltaire, ein Charakterbild*, a study that is both scholarly and fair, has thoroughly investigated the sources and given to the reading public a sketch of this philosopher's last days that is as plausible as it is reliable. He writes:—

“From this moment, that is to say, of the last twenty days of Voltaire's life, we have only very few really historical and coherent reports; and that is quite explainable. The only person attached to Voltaire for the sake of his bread and butter, Wagnière, had been pushed aside since April 29; he had stayed in far-away Ferney, the Swiss home of Voltaire. At the sick-bed his niece and the 'brethren' were watching, all of whom were deeply interested in having nothing unfavorable pass beyond the walls of the palace, if possible, beyond those of the sick-room. What Wagnière reported later on he learned from Morand, the *valet de chambre*. Let us try to draw a picture from the expressions and reports which were made public against their will.

“After his excessive use of opium, Voltaire was usually deprived of his sound mind, and often for twenty-four hours he was delirious. (Laharpe, *Correspondance Littér.*, t. II, p. 240.) Now and then he recognized his friend d'Alembert, pressed his hand, and tried to make himself understood by monosyllables. The friend found this spectacle so heartrending that he could not bear witnessing it. (*To Frederick II*, July 1, 1778.) During the few hours when Voltaire was in possession of his sound mind, he cursed the impotence of the physicians, murmured at, and lamented over, his suffering, and bitterly complained that he could no longer enjoy his glory. (Grimm, *Correspondance Littér.*, t. X, p. 220f.) Wagnière adds that in such moments Voltaire abused his niece, whom he declared to be the cause of his death; for this reason he had practically banished her from his room during the last days. Racle, the engineer, once succeeded in gaining admittance to Voltaire's room and found the wretch just as he tremblingly came out of the bath. *The niece had dismissed the nurse whom the physician had engaged and had placed in the service of her uncle one of her own servants, whom she had commanded not to permit anything to happen without her knowledge and against her interests.* Of all this Voltaire took notice. He called for Wagnière. They told him that they had sent for him. When the secretary did not arrive, Voltaire himself wrote him a letter in the presence of Tronchin. The letter was retained (by the niece), just as the memorandum which he wrote to his notary public. Mademoiselle

Denis expressly said to Mademoiselle de St. Julien: 'My uncle is crazy, and therefore you must not carry out his commands.' When Mademoiselle de St. Julien entered Voltaire's room without the notary public, he cried out, 'O great God, so also you are betraying me!' or, as others report, 'I am forsaken by God and men!'

"Finally, on May 25, Mademoiselle Denis realized that her uncle was hopelessly doomed to a speedy death and that she could now, without incurring any danger, satisfy his longing for Wagnière. She therefore wrote to him: 'Come; for although the weakness of the patient alarms the physician, yet all attacks have ceased, and I hope you will find your master in a better condition.' The rest of the letter deals only with business transactions and with money and ends with the worthy conclusion: 'Bring along as many business papers as you can, for they are essential.' Certainly they were — for the niece!

"On the same day Wagnière received another letter from Voltaire's nephew, d'Hornoy, in which the condition of the patient was fully described and the truth accurately stated, and Wagnière was urged to come at once, since little hope was being held out that he would find the master alive.

"... Indeed, there was no hope at all. The two physicians, Lorry and Tronchin, considered it necessary to tell the patient what his circle of acquaintances had known for a long time. Induced by a letter from d'Alembert, Tronchin set about to inform the patient of his true condition. The physician, a Protestant, was a professing Christian and, as compared with his patient, even religious. He therefore regarded the condition of the patient's soul quite differently from the sick man himself. 'Voltaire,' he wrote to his brother, 'is very sick. If he dies in a cheerful mood, I shall be much deceived.<sup>1)</sup> Before his friends he will not dissimulate, but will indulge his inclinations, no matter how whimsical or cowardly he may feel, especially as he fears to leave the certain for the uncertain. The heaven of the future life is, in truth, not as clear to him as that of Hyères or Montauban, particularly for an old man of eighty years, who is a born coward and very much an enemy of it. I believe his approaching end makes him feel very sad, and I wager that he will not make sport of it. The end will be to Voltaire a deuced moment (*fichu moment*); if he keeps up his courage to the last, we shall have a trivial death.' (Cp. Gaberel, *Voltaire et les Génevois*, p. 166.)

---

1) Voltaire had often said, "I will die laughing if I can."

“So Tronchin went to Voltaire, and after the manner of physicians he announced to him the death sentence in covert words. Voltaire caught the meaning at once. ‘Get me out of it; save me!’ he petitioned the doctor. ‘It is impossible,’ replied Tronchin; ‘impossible; you *must* die!’

“May 30 approached. Exactly two months had passed since the solemn coronation of Voltaire in the theater. Abbé Gaultier heard that he had grown worse, and although he had been stubbornly refused admittance so often, he nevertheless, at this dangerous moment, asked Voltaire by letter to be admitted to his death-bed. Dying, Voltaire was no longer able to read the request, but merely heard what the ‘brethren’ desired. Immediately Abbé Mignot [the nephew and friend of Voltaire. M.] hurried to Abbé Gaultier — it was six o’clock in the evening — and begged him in the name of the patient to come at once. The dying man had not given this command; he had not even been able to take notice of the note of Gaultier; but the purpose was to make people believe that Voltaire had intended to fulfil his ‘obligations.’ [Abbé Mignot was determined upon securing a decent burial for his uncle. M.] ‘Your letter,’ Mignot said to Gaultier, ‘has made a deep impression on my uncle; he desires to confess, but only to you.’ Gaultier declared himself willing to come at once and took with him a detailed form of recantation, which had been prepared beforehand by the church authorities. This he now showed to Mignot. ‘Surely,’ Mignot replied, ‘the form is good; my uncle will subscribe to it; for this I vouch.’ Gaultier now demanded that the Abbé of St. Sulpice be called as witness, and immediately he proceeded to Hôtel Villette. Here Gaultier read the form also to the Marquis [the owner of the Hôtel Villette], and he, too, was of the opinion that no objection could be raised against it. Both were scoundrels [Mignot, the nephew, as well as the Marquis; note how unsparingly Father Kreiten censures the priests of the Catholic Church! M.], since they well knew that Voltaire was no longer able to subscribe to anything and that the form should be merely a certificate to eternal life. All this was done only to show that the dying man and his circle of friends were ready to the last to do the bidding of the Church and that only the ‘regrettable impossibility,’ that is, the coma of the dying man, had prevented this. Certainly, they had waited long enough to be altogether sure that this ‘impossibility’ would occur.

“As soon as the Abbé of St. Sulpice had arrived, the two priests were led into the death-chamber. At first the Abbé of

St. Sulpice spoke, but he was not recognized by the dying man. Then Gaultier addressed him, and since he felt a slight pressure of Voltaire's hand, he had hopes; but soon he was disappointed by the strange words: 'Monsieur Abbé Gaultier, I pray you to pay my compliments to Monsieur Abbé Gaultier.' The delirium was evident. The priests perceived that at present they could not do anything and withdrew with the request that they be called as soon as the patient would regain consciousness.<sup>2)</sup>

"After some time the sick man, for a few moments, regained consciousness. 'I am forsaken by God and man,' he cried in bitter despair. And turning to the bystanders, 'Away, away from me! It is your fault that I am in this wretched condition. Away! I could do without you all, but you needed me! Oh, this is an excellent honor that you procured for me!' At other times he rolled about in his bed, moved by terror and pain; now he groaned, and now he blasphemed the name of God with his mouth. With horror his friends heard him say with a half-choked voice, 'Jesus Christ! Jesus Christ!' When Richelieu heard this most holy name pronounced with blasphemy and wrath, he left the room and said, 'Surely that is too much; no one can stand such a thing.'

"The horrible spectacle continued. The dying man was writhing like a worm on which one has stepped and lacerated himself with his finger-nails. He called for Abbé Gaultier; but his 'friends' remained merciless. So the last moment drew near.

2) So Gaultier relates in his official report. The "friends" have expanded this story. Their version reads: When the sick man was told of the presence of the two priests, he said, "Assure them of my esteem." When they presented the Abbé of St. Sulpice, he kissed his hand and said, "I honor my *curé*." Then they led Gaultier, his confessor, to him. Voltaire said, "Pay my compliments to him and assure him of my gratitude." The confessor now asked him, "Do you acknowledge the deity of Christ?" The sick man, with his open hand and his outstretched arm, thrust him aside. Seizing his head and turning to the other side, he exclaimed with a clear and loud voice, "Let me die in peace." The confessor repeated the question; but now Voltaire, collecting his strength, clenched his fist and pushed him back, crying, "In the name of God, do not talk to me about that man!" Then the priest of St. Sulpice said to the father confessor, "You see, he is not in his right mind." Both then withdrew. In his letter to Frederick II d'Alembert, who was not present at this scene, claims that Voltaire was fully conscious and knew what he did. After the priests had left the room, Voltaire cried with a loud voice, "I am a dead man!" Ten minutes before his death he seized the hand of his servant and said, "Adieu, my dear Morand, I am dying." These were his last words. Another source adds that he also remarked, "Take care of Mama" (Mademoiselle Denis). (Cp. also the statements of the biographers Duvernet and Condorcet; also the *Journal des Débats*, 30 Janvier, 1869; finally, the *Memories of Wagrière*, t. I, p. 161.)

A new attack of despair announced it. 'I feel a hand which seizes me and drags me to the judgment-seat of God.' Then with a vacant stare he gazed at the space at the bedside. 'The devil is there! He wants to grab me! I see him! I see hell! Oh, hide me from it!' At last, in his extreme despair, and tormented by a feverish thirst, he seized the chamber-pot, placed it at his lips, and emptied it. Then, with a fierce cry, he sank back. Blood and slops came forth from his mouth and nose. *Voltaire was dead.*<sup>3)</sup>

"In the year 1758 Voltaire had written to d'Alembert: 'In twenty years the good Lord will have a vacation.'<sup>4)</sup> And twenty years later, on May 30, 1778, in the evening, at eleven o'clock, Voltaire died."

*(To be concluded.)*

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**A Defense of Unionism Refuted.** — The *Lutheran Church Herald* reprints a valuable article from the *Bible Banner*, in which unionism is discussed. Last Thanksgiving Day Dr. S. G. Hägglund of the Augustana Synod took part in a union service in Boston which was participated in by Jews and Unitarians and spoke the benediction. Attacked on that score, he wrote a short defense. Dean Miller replied to this defense in the *Bible Banner*, showing how utterly untenable it is. He first summarizes the arguments of Dr. Hägglund and then presents his counter-arguments. Lack of space forbids our reprinting Dean Miller's remarks verbatim. We must be content with giving his thought as briefly as possible. Dr. Hägglund's arguments were: 1) The meeting was held in a public hall and not in a church. 2) It was in accord with the proclamations of the President and the Governor. 3) A passage from the New Testament was read in the name of Jesus Christ. 4) The benediction was spoken by Dr. Hägglund in the name of the Trinity. 5) Although we must not deny, is it not our duty to be courteous to others? 6) Jesus mingled with publicans and sinners, scribes and Pharisees, and worshiped in the synagog. 7) The truth and purer spirituality will finally prevail. 8) We Lutherans ought not isolate ourselves and allow others to be in sole charge of community services, but put the leaven of true Christianity into the lump. 9) If community services are held in a place of dignity, that factor must not be overlooked.

The following is the gist of Dean Miller's reply: 1) The meeting under consideration was a religious service. The fact that it was held

3) "If the devil could die, he would not die in another way," later some converted eye-witness declared. ("Si le diable pouvait mourir, il ne mourrait pas autrement.") These words, according to the Abbé of St. Sul-pice, were spoken by the chef of Hôtel Villette. (Cp. *Histoire de M. Vuarin par l'Abbé Martin*, t. I, p. 372.)

4) "In zwanzig Jahren wird der liebe Herrgott Feierabend haben."

in a hall does not change its character. 2) The proclamations referred to state that thanksgiving should be rendered in our homes and several places of worship. No compromising of our religious faith by worshiping together with those who hold some other faith is suggested. 3) The reading of a passage from the New Testament in the name of Jesus on such an occasion is more of a compromise than of a confession, because one agrees to worship together with Jews and Unitarians and thereby puts the Christian faith alongside of the Jewish and Unitarian religion, recognizing the latter as being on an equality with Christianity. 4) Pronouncing the benediction in the name of the Triune God in such a union service is more of an indignity than a testimony. It is taking the name of Christ in vain, for it is certain that the Word of God pronounces no benediction upon such mixing of the worship of Belial and Christ. 2 Cor. 6, 15, 16. 5) Courtesy does not require that we unite with representatives of Modernism and heterodoxy in any form of worship. Compare 2 John 9—11. 6) We cannot for an instant accuse Jesus of having had any tolerance whatsoever with the unbelief of the scribes and Pharisees. John 8, 44. Matt. 23 shows that Jesus did not pronounce a benediction upon these people. 7) The truth will prevail; but Jesus cannot use us as instruments for spreading His truth if we compromise with that which is a lie. 8) The Lutheran Church should testify far and wide, but she cannot be of influence for spreading the clear Gospel of salvation if she becomes a partner in worship with the enemies of Christ. 9) We should preach Christ all over, in churches, halls, etc.; but that does not mean that we must join Jews or Unitarians in joint worship.—It is worthy of note that Dr. Miller applies what he says to lodge services also; for he says this question "not only affects the ministers, but also our lay people in their relationship to such unbelievers in the lodge services." We should like to add that the principles which he utters so forcefully apply not only to worship with Jews and Unitarians, but also to false prophets in general, and that non-compliance with the principles of Scripture must lead to severance of fraternal relations.

**"Baptists Necessary."**—So says the *Watchman-Examiner*, December 15, 1927, after having laid down these general principles: "A body of Christians can justify a separate denominational existence on one ground only, and that is, that they hold some distinctive and essential truth that others either pervert or do not teach at all. If a given denomination does not differ materially from others in its order, ordinances, and doctrines, it is a cumberer on the ground and ought not to be. It is a serious thing to fly in the face of our Lord's prayer in John 17 for the unity of His people and perpetuate a sect unless those doing it stand for some essential truth that others do not teach. . . . Our Baptist people would have no trouble making out their case on this ground." In *Why I Am What I Am* Dr. R. S. MacArthur made out this case for the Baptists: 1) "There is absolutely no place for infant baptism in an evangelical system of theology. If baptism will not make a child a Christian, there is no reason for baptizing the child. How can men who adopt the famous

dictum of Chillingworth, 'The Bible, and the Bible only, the Religion of Protestants,' practise infant baptism?" 2) "The baptism of the apostolic churches was immersion, if the tautology of the expression may be permitted. A Baptist does not consider that he is ever at liberty to use a human substitute, such as pouring or sprinkling, for the divine command of baptism." 3) "It has been said that Baptists make too much of Baptism; but in fact no religious body, except the Quakers, make so little of it as they. They have very low ideas as to the necessity of Baptism. They observe Baptism as the organizing principle of church-life. How can a few drops of water or an ocean change the child's relations to God?" Accordingly the essential truth which justifies the separate existence of the Baptist denomination is the teaching that, while Baptism is of little importance, the outward form, immersion, is of great importance, equaled only by the importance of denouncing infant baptism as "the efflorescence of a most gross superstition." Dr. MacArthur has not made out a good case for the Baptists. However, there is an additional plea: "Another point in which Baptists are the exponents both of New Testament and modern ideas is their doctrine of religious freedom, the tenet that the civil magistrate has no authority over a man's religious creed and usage. This was originally a distinctively Baptist idea. For this idea they have again and again shed their blood." The Baptists certainly have stressed this important truth. Great credit is due them. But they had no call to separate from the Church of the Reformation in the interest of this truth. It is not a distinctively Baptist idea. It is a distinctively Lutheran idea. Dr. MacArthur is acquainted with the Augsburg Confession. He says: "The Augsburg Confession of 1530 says: 'They condemn the Anabaptists [a nickname of the Baptists], who reject the baptism of children and say that children are saved without Baptism.'" If he had read on, he would have come across these statements in Article 28: "Civil government deals with other things than does the Gospel. The civil rulers defend not minds, but bodies and bodily things against manifest injuries and restrain men with the sword and bodily punishments in order to preserve civil justice and peace. . . . Therefore the power of the Church and the civil power must not be confounded. The power of the Church has its own commission, to teach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments. . . . After this manner our teachers discriminate between the duties of both these powers." E.

**Letter-Writing Evangelism.** — The *Watchman-Examiner* writes editorially on an opportunity of winning souls which is often overlooked. It says: "We ought by all means to try to win men to Christ. Have you ever tried to approach men by letter? The writer has won scores to Christ by that method. A letter cannot take the place of the spoken word, nor ought it ever to be resorted to from cowardice. But often it is possible to plead with men by letter when a personal conversation with them is impossible. The letter has a distinct advantage in that it can be read over and over again. It has a further advantage in that it eliminates distance. Hand-written letters are

the best because they are recognized as personal and private; but even the dictated letter is not to be despised. Dr. John Timothy Stone says, talking with a traveling man of New York City, 'I never let a day end without dictating a letter to some personal friend about his soul's salvation.' And then he added quietly: 'I want to tell you this: All unconsciously to me, three stenographers in the last few years have been won to the Lord Jesus Christ, won through the letters I have dictated, and in each case I did not know a single word I said was being taken to heart by them.'"

To the apostles' Spirit-guided and Spirit-directed letter-writing we owe the major and most important part of the New Testament. If the Holy Ghost has sanctified this method of winning, instructing, and encouraging souls that are not in close proximity, we ought certainly not to be slack in using it. The world would be better off to-day if Christian parents would write more letters to their children away from home; and how many souls would be saved from damnation if pastors would only take the time to remember in this way those members, especially such as they instructed and confirmed, who afterwards moved to some other city or town! And, above all, a Christian letter to a friend from a Christian friend! Are we not neglecting a wonderful opportunity for good by forgetting one of the most potent means of inspiration and comfort — the personal Christian letter?

MUELLER.

**Neo-Unitarianism in Ulster.** — "The battle that Dr. Henry Cooke fought out in Ulster a century ago must apparently be fought over again," writes the *Sunday-school Times*. "The Presbyterian Assembly of 1927 retained Professor Davey in his position as theological professor. His stand is not essentially different from that of the Non-Subscribers a century ago. Professor Davey tells us that in Christ 'we have a perfect spirit in the imperfect vestments — social, historical, and intellectual — of a provincial Judaism and an apocalyptic piety. . . . Jesus was subject to variations of the nervous system as Paul was. . . . Christ would not have spoken of the innocent suffering for the guilty. He would not regard Himself as innocent any more than good. . . . If Christ is not a final revelation, still less are our Scriptures. . . . I do not think that for practical purposes it can have any but an injurious outcome to say that Jesus Christ is the highest that is possible.'

"Canon Mozley tells us that the Arians taunted the Nicene Fathers with being poor, unintellectual men. It is curious to note how the same taunt comes from the mouths of Arians of our own day. The Nicene Fathers were not disturbed, but merely insisted that what they taught was the doctrine that the apostles had delivered to the Church and that had been held by the Church ever since. 'The same, the very same,' they repeated. They were right, and they triumphed. The Irish Presbyterians also triumphed in their day after a stiff fight with the intruders. If the Christian Church in America is ultimately to win over a conscienceless and subtle Unitarianism, it is high time to awake out of sleep and realize what its deadliest enemy is doing."

MUELLER.

## Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

In the current volume of the *Freikirche*, published by our brethren in Germany, Rev. A. Huebener, submits, in a number of issues, a valuable discussion of a book which constitutes a vehement onslaught on "Missouri," the writer being Dr. Slotty of the Breslau Synod. These articles ought to be read far and wide in order that people may become acquainted with the refutation of wrong views about our Synod's doctrinal position.

Prof. Carl Stange, of Goettingen, has declined the call to Berlin to become the successor of Professor Seeberg (cf. our March issue).

In Tuebingen the seventy-fifth birthday of Dr. Adolph Schlatter was observed recently. This conservative theologian is said to be so popular as a teacher that the room in which he lectures had to be provided with special seats to accommodate the students anxious to hear him.

Archbishop Soederblom has written a reply to the recent papal encyclical on the union of all Christians. He refers to the invitation sent the Roman See to be represented at the conference in Stockholm, although the opinion was voiced in the committee that Rome was heterodox and hence should not be sent an invitation. What blindness shown by Soederblom and his *confrères* in asking the Antichrist in Rome to join them in brotherly deliberations rather than to call upon him to repent!

Says the *Presbyterian* of April 5: "Something has happened in the minds of the followers of John Calvin and John Wesley that could hardly have been predicted fifty years ago. They have both come to see the rich spiritual possibilities of the Lenten season. . . . Evangelism seems increasingly easy as we approach the cross and the empty tomb and the risen Lord. It [*i. e.*, Lent] is thus a season of twofold value, a time of special devotion, communion, abstinence, and also a great hour for the ingathering of precious souls."

The German Field Marshal Erich von Ludendorff has taken up the cudgels against Freemasonry. The *Ev.-Luth. Kirchenblatt* of South America has some valuable comments on the famous general's writings in which he combats Freemasonry, stressing especially its dangerous character from a political point of view. He puts Freemasonry down as an organization which desires to do away with national lines in the interest of a cosmopolitan Judaism and aims at the destruction of Christianity. In Berlin, we are told, forty pastors, some of them prominent men, are Freemasons. The *Deutsche Christliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft* recently demanded that all ministers belonging to lodges who do not leave the lodge within half a year should be deposed.

The *Presbyterian* says that the General Assembly statistics of its Church report 2,998 churches with no additions on confession of faith. In explanation it says that the same statistics report 1,995 vacant churches, that is, churches without the services of a regular pastor. Of these vacant churches 240 report no membership (I suppose that means that nothing is said in the report as to the number of members) and more than one hundred, a membership of 25 or less. To the outsider the situation would seem to be alarming.

Montreal, Can., has among its citizens a prominent Modernist, namely, Dr. Richard Roberts. According to the *Sunday-school Times* this man recently made a remarkable confession. He admits that he does not know what to do. "Action requires conviction, and we are without convictions." "We have opinions, car-loads of them; but only convictions discharge themselves in acts." He and his brethren know very well that only faith conquers the world, and still they will not have faith.

*Times* reports that the new, critical edition of the Vulgate, which is in the course of preparation by a commission of Benedictine monks under the guidance of Cardinal Gasquet, is making progress and that the second volume will soon be in the hands of the public. Twenty thousand manuscripts have been gathered and are being compared.

The A. A. A. A. (American Association for the Advancement of Atheism) is reported to have as its objective, among other things, taxation of church property, secularization of marriage with divorce upon request, and removal of "In God we trust" from coins and of the cross from above the flag. While justified in its protest against the mingling of Church and State, the association is evidently on a course leading to the deepest pools of filth.

In explaining why the churches are not growing more rapidly, Missionary C. H. Fenn, who is home on furlough, said, so we are told: "The Church is suffering from fatty degeneration of the heart, pernicious anemia, cerebro-spinal meningitis, cancer, and neuritis." There is much truth in this. It must not be overlooked, however, that according to the Scriptures the last times are to be a period of ever-increasing unbelief.

We Americans are so prone to fondle a new fad or to rush into novel experiments. The *Watchman-Examiner* quotes this from a daily paper: "The only reason a great many Americans do not own an elephant is that they have never been offered an elephant for a dollar down and easy weekly payments."

## BOOK REVIEW.

**Search the Scriptures!** *IV. A Survey of the Writers and the Books of the Bible.* 40 pages. *V. The Chief Doctrines of the Bible.* 43 pages. *VI. Survey of Old Testament History* (Biographical). 36 pages. 15 cts. each. By Paul E. Kretzmann, Ph. D., D. D. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Three additional booklets in the *Search the Scriptures* series are off the press. Originally intended for the use of Bible classes in our Sunday-schools, these booklets can with great profit be used also by all the Christian men and women of our congregations. Especially would we like to see No. V, *The Chief Doctrines of the Bible*, in the hands of many of our church-members and diligently studied by them. On the basis of the most important Scripture-passages it offers a course in Christian doctrine as we confess it in the Apostles' Creed, all of which is introduced by a few lessons on the Bible itself. We are of the opinion that indoctrination needs to be stressed in an increased measure if our people in these days of apostasy are to remain faithful to the truth and by means of the Word of God are to be kept in God's grace.

FRITZ.

**The Fundamental Differences Between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.** Edited with notes and comments by John Theodore Mueller. 20 pages,  $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{8}$ . 10 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

In this tract Professor Mueller shows, on the basis of the Visitation Articles of 1592, how the Reformed churches differ from the Lutheran Church in the doctrines of the Holy Supper, the Person of Christ, Holy Baptism, and the Predestination and Eternal Providence of God. The errors of the Reformed churches were from the very beginning the result of a wrong attitude of those churches toward Scripture. It is this same wrong attitude, followed out with greater consistency and with equally greater perniciousness, which finds its extreme exponents in the Modernists of our day.

FRITZ.

**The Cures of Christian Science in the Light of Holy Scriptures.**  
 Tract No. 107. By *O. C. A. Boecler*. 16 pages. 5 cts.; dozen, 48 cts.  
 (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." "To be forewarned is to be forearmed." We should not wait until some of our Christian people have become infatuated with, and ensnared by, such delusions as Christian Science before we expose these delusions as damnable heresies, but we should in time warn our people against them and impart the necessary instruction. Christian Science is a damnable system of religion, denying the true God, the reality of sin, and the need of a Savior. This is emphasized in Professor Boecler's tract.

FRITZ.

**A Knock at Your Door.** By *W. E. Schramm*. 87 pages; 75 cts.—**The Church Through the Ages.** A Pageant. By *Prof. W. F. Schmidt*. 35 pages; 35 cts.—**A Friend at Your Door.** By *W. E. Schramm*. 14 pages; 6 cts.—**Modernism, a Pagan Movement in the Christian Church.** By *Prof. P. H. Buehring*. 49 pages; 50 cts. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These four publications of the Columbus Book Concern are designed to help the pastor in bringing home to his people the great truths of salvation. *A Friend at Your Door* is an earnest appeal to accept Jesus, who comes to the sinner through the Word. It is a fine tract for general distribution. The thoughts briefly suggested in the pamphlet are enlarged and applied in the author's book *A Knock at Your Door*, which is a helpful study in sin and grace. *The Church Through the Ages* is a pageant which may be given either in a church or in a hall. It shows the Church in the purity of its founding, in its corruption, and finally in its restoration through Martin Luther. *Modernism* contains five lectures delivered by the author in July, 1927, to the Pastors' Group of the Lutheran Chautauqua at Lakeside, O. It is an excellent examination and refutation of the falsehoods of Modernism, or neo-paganism.

MUELLER.

**The Beginners' Hebrew Grammar.** By *Rev. Harold L. Creager, B.D.*, with the collaboration of *Rev. Herbert C. Alleman, D.D.* \$3.00. (D. C. Heath & Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book, the production of a Gettysburg professor, who was assisted by his colleague, seems to the reviewer to be an excellent manual for beginners in Hebrew. Contrary to current notions, Hebrew is a very simple language, and if the fundamental processes are really mastered, the student has little difficulty in acquiring a fair reading knowledge of it. The book before us contains the necessary grammatical material and, in addition, exercises for translation (Hebrew and English) and vocabularies. A novel method is employed in teaching the irregular verb, which the authors say has proved helpful (a fictitious verb root is used, formed by substituting the particular weak letter for the corresponding letter in *qatal*). Altogether, the work betokens that it is the result of careful thought and long experience. The mechanical make-up is very good. Teachers of Hebrew may do well to compare this work with the manual they have been using; and ministers, I am sure, will be delighted if in their spare hours they review their Hebrew grammar with the aid of this book.

**Luther and the Reformation.** By *James MacKinnon, Ph.D., D.D.*  
Vol. II: The Breach with Rome (1517—21). 354 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ .  
Bound in cloth. \$6.40. (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. London,  
1928.) Order from Concordia Publishing House.

This is the second volume of a work by the Professor of Church History in the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. The first volume was reviewed in this magazine after its publication in 1925, and we are informed that the manuscript for the remaining two additional volumes is nearly complete. Vol. II deserves the high praise which we accorded to its predecessor. It is based upon the same conscientious study not only of the most recent research, but also of the writings of the Reformer himself; is as acute in its analysis of the causes which lay behind the Reformation as of the motives which actuated Luther at various stages in his career; and in spite of its scientific attitude again displays an enthusiasm for its subject. The volume carries Luther through the years 1517—21, the turning-point in his life and the foundation-years of the Reformation. Luther here appears indeed as "the prophet and the apostle of a new age." Luther "was undoubtedly the strong man and also the great man of the age. All the other actors on the stage of this world upheaval are mediocre figures compared with this Colossus, whose genius and potent personality are laboriously shaping a new world out of the old" (p. 283). Again we live through the intense excitement produced in Germany and in Rome through Luther's proclamation of the doctrine of justification by faith and his insistence upon the rights of the individual conscience over against the dictates of the hierarchy. The efforts of the Pope to suppress this "prophet of a new age" are described with a wealth of detail: browbeating and brutal threats, flattery, dialectic debate, more sinister threats,—the red glare of the stake illuminates, as it were, every chapter of MacKinnon's book,—finally, promises of a bishopric, of a cardinalate, anything to silence this voice! Through it all the consistent, unshakable purpose of the Reformer to proclaim without subtraction or compromise the newly discovered essence of Gospel Christianity, Justification by Faith, and to maintain at all costs the right of conscience.

Passing by a few minor matters, there are two points in which the author has shown a want of appreciation for Luther's position. He finds fault with Luther's *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* because, while exhibiting "the independence and daring of an extraordinary, original mind," yet, having proved his accusations against the medieval Church, Luther "invariably hesitates to draw the inevitable practical conclusion. One begins to doubt whether Luther, whilst undoubtedly an original thinker, has also the gift of initiating and organizing the reform movement which he has called into being" (p. 261). MacKinnon acknowledges in the next sentence that Luther's method was to leave to God the remedy "by means of the Word acting on public opinion," but appreciates too little the grandeur of this attitude, although elsewhere he shows true insight into the methods of Martin Luther, as when he says: "His conservative instinct persistently shows itself in the disposition to be content with the enunciation of principles, without insisting on their general application in practise in the form of a radical and imperative revolution of existing institutions" (p. 333).

The other point on which we must find fault with our author is his treatment of Luther's discussion of the Lord's Supper (in the *Babylonian Captivity*). He attributes to Luther the doctrine of "consubstantiation, *i. e.*, the real or bodily presence of Christ in the elements in virtue of their consecration." And he continues: "It does not occur to him that the literal sense is not necessarily the true sense and that the symbolic sense is alone in accordance with the historic meaning. . . . In this matter he has still one foot in the Middle Ages." The familiar Zwinglian conception of the Sacrament, not so surprising in a Reformed historian,—although attributing the doctrine of consubstantiation to Luther and the Lutheran Church is really not excusable in a writer who otherwise shows such accurate information and such fine sympathy for his subject.

The book is excellently printed,—(we have found a single typographical error, "first paper will" for "first paper wall," p. 232),—and the price has been made possible only through a grant made by the Carnegie University's Trust.

G.

**The Book of Life.** (Various bindings and various prices.) (John Rudin & Company, Chicago, Ill.)

This is the fourth edition of a set of books offering the text of the Authorized Version for ordinary readers. When certain criticisms were made with regard to the second and third editions, it was suggested that the introductory material, which was objectionable, might be neutralized or rendered innocuous by certain changes in the text. Although this was a rather difficult task, the reviewer feels that the undertaking was successful. In other words, the set, in its introductory material, is not Lutheran or confessional in character, but the historical information is, on the whole, reliable.—But the chief value of this set lies in the excellent arrangement of the text of the Bible, which will immediately appeal to modern readers. All the books are embellished with excellent illustrations from the best masters of the world, many of them in colors, together with photographs of scenes in Bible lands and many maps. There is no doubt that the use of this set in the home will bring about a greater love for the Word of God and a better appreciation of its historical background. Possibly readers will not agree with certain features of Vol. VIII, but here at least the index and the various lists will prove of great value.

K.

**Understanding the Apostles' Creed.** By Donald McFayden, P. D., Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis. 300 pages. \$2.60. (The Macmillan Company, New York.)

Dr. D. McFayden is an ordained Episcopalian clergyman, who at present teaches Church History at Washington University, St. Louis. His book was suggested to him by the Modernistic trend to discard the Apostles' Creed. Professor McFayden wishes it to be preserved. He "yearns for its retention; for its recitation brings us into contact with the faith of Christianity's Golden Age" (p. 300). But that faith Dr. McFayden himself no longer holds. He is a Modernist. Although he is professor of Church History, only the first chapter of his book has historic value; the rest is speculation, a dream picture of how Christianity developed and was crystallized into its apostolic and postapostolic form. Its source is ancient

Babylonia; Judaism, crude, barbaric, uncritical, is the next step. Then comes contact with Alexandria and Platonism; then Jesus, the Son of Man. He advanced Messianic claims; "but the precise sense in which He regarded Himself as the Messiah it is impossible to define with certainty" (p. 95). He dies; He is raised from the dead. How? The author does not venture to say. "The explanation of these experiences involves a complication of historical, psychological, and ontological questions which very fortunately we may here lay aside" (p. 98). At least the apostles believe that God raised Him from the dead. But they are Jews, hopelessly wrapped up in Jewish categories. Enters Paul the Gentile. He frees Christianity from its Jewish shackles. Alexandria once more enters into it with its philosophic speculation; also Egyptian Isis worship, Persian Mithraism, Babylonian star worship, various Asiatic cults of Mother Earth, and Judaism. The author does not say this so clearly, but he suggests it. Christianity becomes clarified. Follows the Old Roman Symbol, the forerunner of the Apostles' Creed; in the course of time additions are made, and thus we have *Symbolum Apostolicum*. How did the ancient Church understand it? The author endeavors to show this in a long chapter entitled "Exegesis." This is one of the better chapters of the book; for here he moves on historic ground, although sometimes an amazing exegesis creeps in. "The communion of saints may equally well be translated *participation in holy things*" (p. 207). However, it is clear that to-day the Apostles' Creed cannot be taken in its historic sense. "Theology, no less than natural science, must bow to newly ascertained facts and reshape its ideas to allow for them" (p. 296). Also, "it is apt to be infected by faulty logic" (*ibid.*). "Theology must of necessity adjust her teachings to changed conceptions in other fields of thought" (p. 297). Why, then, retain the erring Creed? Oh, because it links us with the past! Such is the drift of thought in this hopelessly disappointing book. For the conservative pastor, who believes that the truths expressed in the Apostles' Creed are eternal verities, which survive the ever-changing tendencies of human thought, the book can teach only one lesson, namely, that of the utter bankruptcy of Modernism. It takes, but does not give; it removes the kernel and still holds to the form, because it has nothing better to offer.

MUELLER.

**Difficult Bible Questions Answered.** Scriptural Knowledge for the Layman. \$1.50. (The World Syndicate Co., New York.)

This volume, treating one thousand topics, "represents the combined labors of careful scholars of all denominations, conducted along the lines followed by the ablest orthodox expositors of the present day" (Foreword). The layman who has mastered the Synodical Catechism will do well to pursue his further Biblical studies with the help of Zorn's *Handbook for Home Study, Questions on Christian Topics*, and similar handbooks. But any one who wishes to be informed on the present status of modern theology, of the conservative type, will find the present volume useful. He will also find in it much useful information on Bible questions. He will hardly bother with the questions whether "Adam was a red man," "what was the name of Potiphar's wife," and the like. But he will be glad to find clear testimony to important Bible truths. John 10, 30 is quoted as

one of "the most definite and powerful assertions of the deity of Christ." Further: "Are any by nature 'children of God'? Regenerated men only are God's children." Adam and Eve actually ate fruit; the saying is not a parable. The Biblical term "hell" is used, not in a symbolical, but in a literal sense. There is no remission of sin without the shedding of blood. "What is justification? It is of grace by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, earned by the shedding of His blood and sealed by His resurrection. This righteousness we may only take as our own by faith, not by our works or by faith and works, but purely by grace, through faith." We get a fine exposition of Rom. 5, 7, the Scriptural judgment on "indulgences," a sane treatment of "church-suppers" and other practical questions. Many portions of the volume, however, are vitiated through the influence of modern theology. The Bible is "the great divine-human document." "It is not a scientific text-book" (the phrase taken with the modern implication). Jesus was not on earth and in heaven at the same time. The statement: "His divinity must have been restricted by its fleshly environment" is against Scripture. "Still other translators make the passage [Act. 13, 48] read: 'As many as disposed themselves to eternal life believed.'" What would you make of this: "Sanctification is that act of the Holy Spirit in which He calls us through the Gospel, enlightens us by His gifts, sanctifies and preserves us in the true faith, and moves us to holy works. . . . The means of sanctification are internal, the indwelling Holy Spirit, faith and the cooperation of the regenerated will with grace, and external—"? Children are saved, not through faith, but because of their innocence. What is the Second Blessing? "It is not necessary to bother with explanations and definitions." However, "brethren who are undoubtedly sincere believe that it is Scriptural. Who are we that we should say it is not?" "What does the Bible teach of the second coming of Christ?" Two answers are given. The first gives the Scriptural teaching. And the second, without indicating the conflict with the first, unfolds the thesis that "Christ's coming will bring with it the millennial reign."

"Is there any sanction for capital punishment in the New Testament? The whole spirit of the New Testament would seem to be decidedly against it." There are burning questions which are not touched upon. There is nothing said about lodges. Question 269, second part, treats on Matt. 5, 24. Question 277 is an exact duplicate. The space might have been utilized for the discussion of Freemasonry. "Redemption" is made a synonym of conversion, etc., etc. In a word, this book will appeal to the Fundamentalists. A Lutheran wants something better.

E.

**A Pilgrimage to Palestine.** By Harry Emerson Fosdick, D. D. 332 pages. \$2.50. (The Macmillan Company, New York.)

Dr. Fosdick's book on the *Land of the Book* has enjoyed an astounding reception by the reading public, and that for good reasons. The mechanical equipment of the book is as nearly perfect as modern bookmaking can make it; it is a work of art. As far as its contents are concerned, the author has endeavored thoroughly to acquaint the reader with the country to which he made his pilgrimage. It contains a fine map, a survey of dates, which, however, are not always correct,—Dr. Fosdick is an evolutionist,—an index of subjects and of proper names, an index of

Scriptural references, etc. Every line confirms the author's statement that the book "was written *con amore*, for the sheer love of the land about which it tells." In the organizing of the material, too, this volume differs from others written on the same subject; not the geography, but the history of the land furnishes the "strand on which the narrative is threaded." The description is everywhere graphic and charming and the language choice and beautiful. A "selected bibliography for the traveler" proves how eager the writer was to obtain exact and extensive information. The result is that he has furnished a book which occupies a unique place among the volumes that present to the reader the Holy Land. Unfortunately, however, Dr. Fosdick is a Modernist, and his liberalistic prejudices to a large degree destroy the usefulness of his book. The intrinsic untruth of his theology results in statements that are downright false and mar the pleasure of the conservative scholar who reads them. In the opinion of Dr. Fosdick, David "had a strangely jumbled ethical judgment" (p. 116). The Mosaic dispensation, "glorious as it was, it was a primitive beginning. Belief in a mountain god, whose back can be seen of human eyes, a god of war who sends his chosen tribesmen on ruthless raids to slaughter even children without mercy, is a long way behind us—or at least it ought to be" (p. 72). Christ, to Fosdick, was merely a human "teacher who talked with a woman about God" (p. 72). It is with deep regret that we read these and similar untrue statements in this otherwise excellent book. A person who does not know Christ cannot do justice to the land where He preached and where He lived and died; a false theology must of necessity produce a warped history. The pilgrim who studies Palestine must traverse its valleys and tread its hills with a believing heart and a vision directed by the Holy Ghost if he wishes to write a true account.

MUELLER.

**Social Problems. The Christian Solution.** By *E. E. Fischer, D. D.* 187 pages,  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ . \$1.25. (The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House.

The author of this book has evidently given his subject much study. His presentation is clear, concise, fascinating. In ten chapters he discusses: Definition and Nature of Social Problems; Christian Methods of Approach; Christian Social Principles; Family Life; Citizenship; Work; Leisure; War; Racial Relations; Education. Dr. Fischer touches upon many of the evils in our social fabric and shows the Church's attitude over against these. He says: "'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' John 3, 3. This is the indispensable foundation upon which all Christian morality, whether individual or social, must be built. Not by making the material conditions better, but by making man better, does Christianity hope to improve the present social order. The attempt, therefore, to disassociate the task of social regeneration from the task of individual regeneration is neither Christian nor practical and must always prove futile. The evil in human nature is too real and persistent to be overcome in this way. Christian solutions must proceed on the basis of a new life centering in Jesus Christ. To ignore this fact is to be indifferent to the chief contribution which Christianity can make to the solution of social problems" (p. 24). "The cause of all human ills is man's estrangement from God, and only as this estrangement is healed, can a social order

appear which will be pleasing to God" (p. 38). In reference to education Dr. Fischer says: "An education which develops the intellect, without providing at the same time for the control of the sensibility and the will, is a distinct menace. Unless accompanied by a spirit of good will, the possession of power is always dangerous; and knowledge is power of a very definite kind. With the increased control which knowledge is making possible over the wealth and forces of the natural world, to neglect the training of character is to expose civilization to the tyranny of a ruthless selfishness. Instead of being used to further the common good, knowledge will then become a divisive force, standing in the way of the realization of practically every Christian ideal. This is the danger of an irreligious educational system. It fails to develop character" (p. 171). "Religion in education, therefore, means more than merely the addition to the curriculum of another branch of study. It means the permeation of the whole life with a new spirit; the cultivation of true ideals and the impartation of an adequate moral dynamic" (p. 173). "With the gradual disappearance of the home as a factor in education, practically the whole of the child's systematic training, with the exception of what it may receive in the Church, is coming under the control of the school. Educators are realizing this and are endeavoring to meet the responsibility. The curriculum of public school education is being enlarged so as to make it a reproduction in miniature of all that has value or importance for life. The three R's no longer constitute the major portion of the curriculum. A place has been found for manual and business training, for domestic science, for training in polities and citizenship, and even in those social relationships for which the home at one time made itself solely responsible. In fact, every form of activity and relationship is provided for with the exception of one, the religious" (p. 175). Concerning the parochial school as a solution of the educational problem, we read: "Where it has been possible to maintain it, it has solved the problem in a fairly satisfactory way. Its two great advantages are that it makes possible the unification of the educational process, and that it gives the Church control of the child during the most formative period of its life" (p. 176). But while the Doctor presents the parochial school as the ideal solution of the educational problem, he advocates week-day religious instruction supplementing the instructions received in the public school, because "there is little prospect that the parochial school will come back into the Protestant Church as a whole. The public school has secured too strong a hold on the sympathy and good will of the American people. Whatever general system may be devised will have to be supplementary to the public school system and not alternative to it" (p. 176). Over against this statement we are glad to say that our own system of parochial schools has proved to be a success and that our churches are at the present time showing even an increased interest in our parochial school system.

We could quote much from Dr. Fischer's book which has our hearty approval, but we prefer to have our readers purchase the book and give it a careful study, especially at this time when social problems are forcing themselves upon our attention as never before in the history of our country.

A few criticisms we desire to offer. Desertion is not, in addition to fornication, a *second* cause for divorce, but it is in its very nature and

effect the severing of the marriage bond (p. 59). When Paul says: "There is no power but of God; for the powers that be are ordained of God," Rom. 13, 1, we take that as sufficient evidence that the state, even as are the family and the Church, is a divine institution, and therefore it ought not be said: "The state is said to be a divine institution. This does not mean necessarily that it was instituted immediately by God, as were the family and the Church. The origin of the state is lost in antiquity" (p. 75). We cannot admit that the Old Testament "does not set forth a high conception of work, nor does inspire to a lofty morality" (p. 100). On page 122 Dr. Fischer says: "The Christian has a duty of love which should make him willing to surrender his privilege out of regard for others. But this duty devolves upon him only when the 'weak' conscience of his brothers is due to immaturity or moral impotence. He then foregoes what is his right lest he give offense and become a stumbling-block. When, however, the weakness of the brother is due to a deliberate and obstinate refusal to admit the truth, the Christian may be compelled to give offense, as Christ gave offense to the Pharisees by His conduct on the Sabbath-day, and Paul gave offense to certain Jewish Christians by refusing to circumcise Titus. Gal. 2, 3, 4." While the *giving* of offense has been rightly defined in the first instance, the second case is not a case of giving offense, but rather of *taking* offense. In that connection dancing and the theater are spoken of, but their *sinful* nature is not stressed.

On the whole, Dr. Fischer's book is sound, and such criticisms as we have offered are not intended to discount our favorable recommendation of the book. Inasmuch as the social problems of our day make their influence deeply felt in the lives of our church-members, and inasmuch as the Church has a distinct duty to teach the Christian principles which must be applied to such problems, our pastors cannot escape the responsibility they have of studying our social problems in the light of Scriptures. Dr. Fischer's book furnishes much material and suggestive thought in the right direction.

FRITZ.

**The Effective College.** Edited by *Robert L. Kelly*, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City. \$2.00. (The Association of American Colleges.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Here we have a book which ought to be of outstanding interest in the field of higher education. Every man who contributed to this volume is an educator of note in the Association of American Colleges and therefore speaks with authority on his particular topic. We exclude, of course, the section devoted to Religious Education, since this has no value for us. But in the rest of the book, questions which have been agitating the minds for decades are treated in a manner which will make the solution of many problems considerably easier. The course of study is discussed, also the methods in general, the relation between the faculty and the students, the financial support of the institutions, and many other questions which time and again are brought to our attention. It may be that the reader will not agree with certain conclusions reached by the various writers, but the book is intensely stimulating nevertheless and will undoubtedly prove a welcome addition to the library of every one interested in higher education.

K.

**The Catechism of Christian Worship.** By *C. P. Swank*. 40 cts. (United Lutheran Publication House.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The idea which is expressed in this little book of eighty pages is very good. It is a simple form of instruction by which the members of the Church are made acquainted with the wonderful heritage of our Lutheran Church. Every person who makes a study of this little book will derive great benefit therefrom. A few small corrections are in order. On page 22 the statement is made that the Holy Eucharist is considered a sacrifice. This idea is not in keeping with Lutheran doctrine. On page 31 it is stated that the liturgy is binding upon the Church, which, of course, is not in keeping with our Lutheran Confessions. On page 35 the practise of having the congregation stand during the singing of the hymn is advocated, with the plea that the hymns take the place of the psalms used in the early Church. This cannot be maintained. On page 44 the author says that the church service is never complete without the Communion office. This also goes beyond Scripture. On page 55 the author makes a distinction between communicant members and confirmed members. This is in the direction of members at large, a distinction which cannot be held according to Scriptures. A few slight mistakes have also crept in under the heading of the paraments. The better usage has the red vestment for Trinity Sunday, and green is used after the octave of Epiphany, according to ancient Lutheran usage.

K.

**Forgotten Friends.** By *Gerhard Lenski*. 121 pages. \$1.00. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

In five lectures, each of which required about thirty minutes to deliver, the author presents to the reader five great heroes of the Old Testament: Adam, Moses, Solomon, Job, and David, drawing from their faith and failings such lessons as our Christian people need to-day. The idea of thus acquainting his hearers with the saints of the Bible is an excellent one and deserves the fullest praise. The representation is vivid and interesting, the language simple, but gripping, and the lessons which the author inculcates are carefully chosen. Often, however, the statements lack in definiteness, and the reader may draw from them inferences which the writer himself would no doubt deprecate. He, for instance, denounces the modern advocates of evolution and their false theories, but again accords them praise, without, however, limiting the things that are praiseworthy. The sin of Adam, just because it is so inexpressibly dreadful, should have been described more fully, both with regard to its essence and its terrible consequences. Sometimes, too, secular writers are quoted with approval when their statements hardly merit it. Again, the fact that the psalms were written by divine inspiration is not sufficiently stressed. These are only a few of the many faults which we have found while perusing this otherwise commendable effort. Let those who teach beware of unguarded statements. Our Christian testimony must always be clear and decisive.

MUELLER.